UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
REGION 10 HANFORD/INL PROJECT OFFICE
309 Bradley Boulevard, Suite 115
Richland, Washington 99352

May 19, 2006

Frank Roddy
U.S. Department of Energy
PO Box 550, A6-39
Richland, WA 99352

Re: Request for Extension of Review of the 200-MW-1 Remedial Investigation Report and for a Data Quality Objectives Process for Characterizing 216-A-4 and Validating High-Resolution Resistivity (HRR)

Dear Mr. Roddy:

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) appreciates the opportunity to review and comment on the 200-MW-1 Remedial Investigation Report (DOE/RL-2005-62). Work-load prioritization and the need for an extensive review have prompted EPA to request a 30-day extension in the review period for this document. EPA received the document April 28, 2006, and the normal Tri-Party Agreement review period would conclude approximately 30 days later. A 30-day extension (until June 27, 2006) would allow time to provide a meaningful review of the remedial investigation information for the 200-MW-1 operable unit waste sites.

EPA understands that the remedial investigation information for the 216-A-4 Crib and associated analogous waste sites will be incorporated into the Feasibility Study Report for 200-MW-1, rather than in the Remedial Investigation Report because further characterization is required. This was the agreement documented in Tri-Party Agreement Change Notice 147 (TPA-CN-147).

As you know, the originally planned site characterization at 216-A-4 revealed a unique type of waste site that did not match the conceptual model upon which the characterization approach was based. EPA expects the U.S. Department of Energy to begin a Data Quality Objectives process early this summer to address characterization needs for 216-A-4. High-resolution resistivity (HRR) geophysical survey runs in the area south of the PUREX canyon may provide helpful information about the nature and extent of vadose zone contamination resulting from the crib. However, corroboration of the resistivity data and use of the technology at Hanford is necessary to understand how useful it is in refining the conceptual model for this representative waste site. Such "ground-truthing" of the HRR technology is necessary in other locations across Hanford's 200 Area. However, information yielded from a well-designed characterization approach at 216-A-4 will further efforts to economically and effectively characterize waste sites across the Central Plateau.

If you have questions, contact me at (509) 376-8665.

Sincerely,

Craig Cameron

Craig Cameron
Project Manager

cc: Jane Hedges, Ecology
Larry Romine, DOE
Martha Lentz, EPA Office of Env. Assess.
Stuart Harris, CTUIR
Gabriel Bohnee, Nez Perce
Russell Jim, Yakama Nation
Ken Niles, Oregon Dept. of Energy
Todd Martin, Hanford Advisory Board
√Administrative Record: 200-MW-1 OU